arXiv:1207.7338v1 [math.RT] 31 Jul 2012

TORSION PAIRS AND SIMPLE-MINDED SYSTEMS IN TRIANGULATED CATEGORIES.

ALEX DUGAS

Abstract. Let $\mathcal{T}$ be a Hom-finite triangulated Krull-Schmidt category over a field k. Inspired by a definition of Koenig and Liu [8], we say that a family $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ of pairwise orthogonal objects with trivial endomorphism rings is a simple-minded system if its closure under extensions is all of $\mathcal{T}$. We construct torsion pairs in $\mathcal{T}$ associated to any subset $\mathcal{X}$ of a simple-minded system $\mathcal{S}$, and use these to define left and right mutations of $\mathcal{S}$ relative to $\mathcal{X}$. When $\mathcal{T}$ has a Serre functor ν and $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{X}$ are invariant under $\nu \circ [1]$, we show that these mutations are again simple-minded systems. We are particularly interested in the case where $\mathcal{T} = \underline{\text{mod}}\text{-}\Lambda$ for a self-injective algebra Λ. In this case, our mutation procedure parallels that introduced by Koenig and Yang for simple-minded collections in $D^b(\text{mod-}\Lambda)$ [9]. It follows that the mutation of the set of simple Λ-modules relative to $\mathcal{X}$ yields the images of the simple Γ-modules under a stable equivalence $\underline{\text{mod}}\text{-}\Gamma \to \underline{\text{mod}}\text{-}\Lambda$, where Γ is the tilting mutation of Λ relative to $\mathcal{X}$.

1. Introduction

A well-known conjecture of Auslander and Reiten states that two finite-dimensional algebras with equivalent stable module categories have the same number of nonprojective simple modules (up to isomorphism) [2], and work of Martínez-Villa has reduced this problem to the case where the algebras are self-injective [10]. One possible approach to this conjecture involves studying the sets of objects in the stable category $\underline{\text{mod}}\text{-}\Lambda$ of a self-injective algebra Λ, which correspond to the set of simple Γ-modules under some equivalence $\underline{\text{mod}}\text{-}\Gamma \xrightarrow{\approx} \underline{\text{mod}}\text{-}\Lambda$. If one can provide a characterization of such sets that is intrinsic to $\underline{\text{mod}}\text{-}\Lambda$, then perhaps it is possible to prove that all such sets have the same cardinality. In this direction, Pogorzały has taken a few obvious properties of such sets of objects in $\underline{\text{mod}}\text{-}\Lambda$ as the basis for his definition of *maximal systems of stable orthogonal bricks* in [11]. More recently Koenig and Liu have refined this notion in their introduction of *simple-minded systems* [8] (although, to the best of our knowledge, it is not yet known whether these two notions are truly distinct). Briefly, a set of pairwise orthogonal objects in $\underline{\text{mod}}\text{-}\Lambda$ with trivial endomorphism rings forms a simple-minded system if it generates $\underline{\text{mod}}\text{-}\Lambda$ by extensions. This latter condition is naturally difficult to check, and thus non-trivial examples of simple-minded systems are hard to find, especially in the absence of a non-trivial stable equivalence. The primary goal of this article is to define a mutation procedure for simple-minded systems that allows one to easily construct many non-trivial examples starting out from the set of simple modules itself.

Our mutation procedure is a generalization of that introduced in [4], where it was defined only for maximal systems of stable orthogonal bricks and in a more restricted setting. This previous definition was inspired by considering the images of the simple modules under a specific stable equivalence from a *tilting mutation* of Λ. More precisely, for a weakly symmetric algebra Λ and the endomorphism ring Γ of an Okuyama tilting complex T associated to a loopless vertex v in the quiver of Λ, we computed the images of the simple Γ-modules under the stable equivalence induced by the derived equivalence $D^b(\text{mod-}\Gamma) \to D^b(\text{mod-}\Lambda)$ given by T. The images of the simple Γ-modules under this stable equivalence naturally form a maximal system of stable orthogonal bricks in $\underline{\text{mod}}\text{-}\Lambda$, which coincides with the mutation $\mu_v^+(\mathcal{S})$ of the set $\mathcal{S}$ of simple Λ-modules relative to the vertex/simple v. It follows from deep, new results of Koenig and Yang [9] that the same is true in general: Mutating the simple-minded system consisting of the simples in $\underline{\text{mod}}\text{-}\Lambda$ yields the set of images of the simple Γ-modules under the stable equivalence from the corresponding tilting mutation Γ of Λ. In particular, it is thus possible to track the Morita-equivalence classes of the various algebras Γ that can be obtained from Λ by successively tilting via Okuyama complexes by computing successive mutations of the simple Λ-modules inside $\underline{\text{mod}}\text{-}\Lambda$.

This paper is organized as follows. We begin working in an abstract Hom-finite triangulated Krull-Schmidt category $\mathcal{T}$. In Section 2, we develop some basic properties of filtration subcategories generated by a maximal system of orthogonal bricks in $\mathcal{T}$. As our definition of mutation of simple-minded systems makes use of torsion pairs in $\mathcal{T}$, we study these in Section 3. We show, in particular, that one obtains natural examples corresponding to any subset of a simple minded system in $\mathcal{T}$. Using these torsion pairs, we then define left and right mutations of a simple minded system $\mathcal{S}$ at a subset $\mathcal{X}$ in Section 4. Our main result states that these mutations are again simple minded systems provided $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{X}$ are invariant under $\nu \circ [1]$, where ν is a Serre functor for $\mathcal{T}$. The bulk of the proof involves showing that the mutation of a simple-minded system again generates $\mathcal{T}$ by extensions. It turns out that in $\underline{\text{mod}}$-Λ our mutations of simple-minded systems closely parallel the mutations of *simple-minded collections* in $D^b(\text{mod-}\Lambda)$ studied by Koenig and Yang in [9]. Thus, in Section 5 we describe how new results of Koenig and Yang connect mutation of simple minded systems in $\underline{\text{mod}}$-Λ to tilting mutations of Λ, generalizing one of the main results of [4], and to *silting mutation* in $K^b(\text{proj-}\Lambda)$ as introduced by Aihara and Iyama [1].

2. Filtration subcategories

Let k be a field and let $\mathcal{T}$ be a Hom-finite Krull-Schmidt triangulated k-category with suspension [1]. We write $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ for a subset of $\text{ob}(\mathcal{T})$, which we identify with the corresponding full subcategory of $\mathcal{T}$. For $\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$, we set $\langle \mathcal{C} \rangle = \text{add}(\mathcal{C})$ and

$$\mathcal{C} * \mathcal{D} = \{X \in \mathcal{T} \mid \text{there is a triangle } C \to X \to D \to \text{ with } C \in \mathcal{C}, D \in \mathcal{D}\}.$$

The next lemma shows that formation of these extension subcategories is associative.

Lemma 2.1. *Let* $\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$. *Then* $(\mathcal{C} * \mathcal{D}) * \mathcal{E} = \mathcal{C} * (\mathcal{D} * \mathcal{E})$.

Proof. Let $X \in (\mathcal{C} * \mathcal{D}) * \mathcal{E}$ so that we have triangles $X' \longrightarrow X \longrightarrow Y \to$ and $Z \longrightarrow X' \longrightarrow W \to$ with $Z \in \mathcal{C}, W \in \mathcal{D}$ and $Y \in \mathcal{E}$. By the octahedral axiom we have a commutative diagram where the rows and columns are distinguished triangles in $\mathcal{T}$.

$$\begin{tikzcd}
Z \arrow[r, equal] \arrow[d] & Z \arrow[d] & & \\
X' \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & X \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & Y \arrow[r] \arrow[d, equal] & {} \\
W \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & U \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & Y \arrow[r] & {} \\
{} & {} & &
\end{tikzcd}$$

The bottom row shows that $U \in \mathcal{D} * \mathcal{E}$, and now the second column shows that $X \in \mathcal{C} * (\mathcal{D} * \mathcal{E})$. The reverse inclusion is proved similarly. □

We say that $\mathcal{C}$ is *extension-closed* if $\mathcal{C} * \mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$. For $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$, we can define various filtration subcategories inductively as follows:

$$(\mathcal{C})_n = \begin{cases} \{0\} & \text{if } n = 0 \\ (\mathcal{C})_{n-1} * (\mathcal{C} \cup \{0\}) & \text{if } n \geq 1 \end{cases} \tag{2.1}$$

$$_n(\mathcal{C}) = \begin{cases} \{0\} & \text{if } n = 0 \\ (\mathcal{C} \cup \{0\}) * {}_{n-1}(\mathcal{C}) & \text{if } n \geq 1 \end{cases} \tag{2.2}$$

Observe that these filtration subcategories form ascending chains: $\{0\} = (\mathcal{C})_0 \subseteq (\mathcal{C})_1 \subseteq (\mathcal{C})_2 \subseteq \cdots$ and similarly for the $_n(\mathcal{C})$. Furthermore, observe that each $(\mathcal{C})_n$ and each $_n(\mathcal{C})$ is a *strict* subcategory, meaning that it is closed under isomorphisms. However, in general, these subcategories need not be closed under direct summands. We begin by showing that these two chains of subcategories are identical.

Lemma 2.2. *For any* $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ *we have* $(\mathcal{C})_n = {}_n(\mathcal{C})$ *for all* $n \geq 0$.

Proof. Clearly the equality holds for $n = 0, 1$. Using Lemma 2.1 it is now easy to see that it holds for all $n \geq 0$ by induction. □

We now define the *filtration subcategory generated by* $\mathcal{C}$ to be $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{C}) = \cup_{n\geq 0}(\mathcal{C})_n$. It follows from the next lemma that $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{C})$ is the smallest extension-closed subcategory of $\mathcal{T}$ containing $\mathcal{C}$.

Lemma 2.3. *For any* $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$*, we have* $(\mathcal{C})_n * (\mathcal{C})_m = (\mathcal{C})_{n+m}$ *for all* $m, n \geq 0$*. In particular, the filtration subcategory* $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{C})$ *is closed under extensions.*

Proof. We use induction on m. By definition of $(\mathcal{C})_n$, the equality holds for all $n \geq 0$ when $m = 0$. Now suppose that it holds for all $n \geq 0$ and all $k < m$, for some $m \geq 2$. By Lemma 2.1, we have $(\mathcal{C})_n * (\mathcal{C})_m = ((\mathcal{C})_n * (\mathcal{C})_{m-1}) * (\mathcal{C} \cup \{0\}) = (\mathcal{C})_{n+m-1} * (\mathcal{C} \cup \{0\}) = (\mathcal{C})_{n+m}$. □

We are mainly interested in filtration subcategories that are generated by a set of objects that behave like simple objects in $\mathcal{T}$. The following definitions, inspired by [11], are slightly more general than those used in [4].

Definition 2.4. *A set* $\mathcal{S} = \{S_i\}_{i\in I}$ *of objects of* $\mathcal{T}$ *is set of* **(pairwise) orthogonal bricks** *in* $\mathcal{T}$ *if*

$$(1) \quad \mathcal{T}(S_i, S_j) \cong k^{\delta_{ij}} \text{ for all } i, j \in I. \text{ (Here, } \delta_{ij} \text{ is the Kronecker } \delta.)$$

We say that $\mathcal{S}$ *is a* **maximal system of orthogonal bricks** *in* $\mathcal{T}$ *if additionally*

$$\begin{array}{ll} (2) & \forall\, X \in \mathcal{T}\ \exists\, i \in I \text{ such that } \mathcal{T}(X, S_i) \neq 0; \text{and} \\ (2') & \forall\, Y \in \mathcal{T}\ \exists\, i \in I \text{ such that } \mathcal{T}(S_i, Y) \neq 0. \end{array}$$

We will also consider the following stronger definition, inspired by Koenig and Liu [8].

Definition 2.5. *A set* $\mathcal{S}$ *of orthogonal bricks in* $\mathcal{T}$ *is a* **simple-minded system** *if* $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{S}) = \mathcal{T}$*. In this case, any object* $X \in \mathcal{T}$ *has an* $\mathcal{S}$**-length** $l_{\mathcal{S}}(X) := \min\{n \geq 0 \mid X \in (\mathcal{S})_n\}$.

Remarks. (1) As in [8], it is not hard to see that a simple-minded system is a maximal system of orthogonal bricks. We do not know if the converse holds in general.

(2) If $\mathcal{T}$ has a Serre functor ν inducing a Serre duality $\mathcal{T}(X, Y) \cong D\mathcal{T}(Y, \nu X)$ for all $X, Y \in \mathcal{T}$, then (2) and (2') in the definition of maximal system of orthogonal bricks are easily seen to be equivalent. Moreover, in the presence of a Serre duality, it is natural to require a maximal system of orthogonal bricks, or a simple-minded system, $\mathcal{S}$ to satisfy

$$(3) \quad \nu(\mathcal{S}[1]) = \mathcal{S}.$$

This is due to the fact that if $\mathcal{T} = \underline{\text{mod}}\text{-}A$ for a self-injective algebra A, then $\nu = \mathcal{N}\Omega$ so that $\nu(X[1]) = \mathcal{N}(X)$, where $\mathcal{N}$ denotes the Nakayama functor. In particular, since $\mathcal{N}$ permutes the simple A-modules, and commutes with any stable equivalence, any simple-minded system in $\underline{\text{mod}}\text{-}B$ which arises as the image of the simple A-modules under an equivalence $\underline{\text{mod}}\text{-}A \to \underline{\text{mod}}\text{-}B$ will be stable under $\mathcal{N}$.

Lemma 2.6. *Let* $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ *be a set of orthogonal bricks, and suppose that there is a distinguished triangle* $Y \longrightarrow X \xrightarrow{f} S_i \to$ *with* $X \in (\mathcal{S})_n$ *for some* $n \geq 1$*,* $S_i \in \mathcal{S}$ *and* $f \neq 0$*. Then* $Y \in (\mathcal{S})_{n-1}$.

Proof. We proceed by induction on $n \geq 1$. If $n = 1$, then $f \neq 0$ implies that f is an isomorphism. Hence $Y = 0 \in (\mathcal{S})_0$. Now assume that the statement is true for $n - 1$, where $n \geq 2$. Since $X \in (\mathcal{S})_n$, we have a triangle $X' \longrightarrow X \xrightarrow{g} S_j \to$ with $S_j \in \mathcal{S}$ (note that we may assume that $S_j \neq 0$, as otherwise we would have $X \in (\mathcal{S})_{n-1}$, and we would be done by the induction hypothesis). By the octahedral axiom we have a commutative diagram where the rows and columns are distinguished triangles in $\mathcal{T}$.

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & X' \arrow[r, equal] \arrow[d, "i"] & X' \arrow[d, "fi"] & \\
Y \arrow[r] \arrow[d, equal] & X \arrow[r, "f"] \arrow[d, "g"] & S_i \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & {} \\
Y \arrow[r] & S_j \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & Z \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & {} \\
 & {} & {} &
\end{tikzcd}$$

By the rotation axiom, we thus obtain triangles $Z[-1] \longrightarrow X' \xrightarrow{fi} S_i \to$ and $Z[-1] \longrightarrow Y \longrightarrow S_j \to$. As long as $fi \neq 0$, we can use the induction hypothesis to conclude that $Z[-1] \in (\mathcal{S})_{n-2}$ and then that $Y \in (\mathcal{S})_{n-1}$. Thus assume that $fi = 0$. Thus f factors as $f = hg$ for some nonzero $h : S_j \to S_i$. Hence h must be an isomorphism and it follows that $Y \cong X' \in (\mathcal{S})_{n-1}$. □

Lemma 2.7. *If $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ is a set of orthogonal bricks, then $(\mathcal{S})_n$ is closed under direct summands for each $n \geq 1$. In particular, $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{S})$ is closed under direct summands.*

Proof. We proceed by induction on n. For $n = 1$ the statement is clear since each $S_i \in \mathcal{S}$ is indecomposable. Thus let $n \geq 2$ and assume that $(\mathcal{S})_{n-1}$ is closed under direct summands. Suppose that $X \oplus Y \in (\mathcal{S})_n$, and that we have a triangle $X' \xrightarrow{\left(\begin{smallmatrix} a \\ b \end{smallmatrix}\right)} X \oplus Y \xrightarrow{(c\ d)} S_i \to$ with $S_i \in \mathcal{S}$ and $X' \in (\mathcal{S})_{n-1}$. If $c = 0$ then the inclusion $X \to X \oplus Y$ factors through $\left(\begin{smallmatrix} a \\ b \end{smallmatrix}\right)$, which implies that 1_X factors through a. Thus X is isomorphic to a direct summand of X' and so $X \in (\mathcal{S})_{n-1} \subseteq (\mathcal{S})_n$ by the induction hypothesis. Now assume $c \neq 0$. We thus have triangles $X'' \longrightarrow X \xrightarrow{c} S_i \to$ and $X'' \oplus Y \longrightarrow X \oplus Y \xrightarrow{(c\ 0)} S_i$, with $X'' \oplus Y \in (\mathcal{S})_{n-1}$ by Lemma 2.6. By the induction hypothesis, we obtain $X'' \in (\mathcal{S})_{n-1}$ and hence $X \in (\mathcal{S})_n$. □

3. TORSION PAIRS

In this section we introduce and study a version of torsion pairs in triangulated categories that appears in recent work of Aihara and Iyama [1]. This definition is slighty weaker than that used by Beligiannis and Reiten [3], as it is better suited for stable module categories than for derived categories. For $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ we set

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}^{\perp} &= \{X \in \mathcal{T} \mid \mathcal{T}(C, X) = 0 \text{ for all } C \in \mathcal{C}\} \\ {}^{\perp}\mathcal{C} &= \{X \in \mathcal{T} \mid \mathcal{T}(X, C) = 0 \text{ for all } C \in \mathcal{C}\} \end{aligned}$$

It is immediate that both $\mathcal{C}^{\perp}$ and ${}^{\perp}\mathcal{C}$ are strict, extension closed subcategories of $\mathcal{T}$ which are also closed under direct summands. We shall also write ${}^{\perp}\mathcal{C}^{\perp}$ for the intersection ${}^{\perp}\mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{C}^{\perp}$.

Definition 3.1. *We say that a pair $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D})$ of additive subcategories of $\mathcal{T}$, which are closed under direct summands, form a* **torsion pair** *if the following hold:*

- (TP1) $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}) = 0$*;*
- (TP2) $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{C} * \mathcal{D}$. *That is, for each $X \in \mathcal{T}$, there exists a distinguished triangle $C_X \xrightarrow{f_X} X \xrightarrow{g_X} D_X \to$ with $C_X \in \mathcal{C}$ and $D_X \in \mathcal{D}$.*

In light of (TP2), we easily see that (TP1) can be strengthened to

$$\text{(TP1')} \quad \mathcal{C}^{\perp} = \mathcal{D} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{C} = {}^{\perp}\mathcal{D}.$$

In particular, we see that the subcategories making up a torsion pair are necessarily extension-closed. In any triangle as in (TP2), notice that (TP1) implies that f_X is a right $\mathcal{C}$-approximation and g_X is a left $\mathcal{D}$-approximation. In particular, if $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D})$ is a torsion pair then $\mathcal{C}$ is contravariantly finite in $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ is covariantly finite in $\mathcal{T}$. It is natural to wonder whether this triangle is unique up to isomorphism. A priori, there is no reason it must be. However, since $\mathcal{T}$ is assumed to be a Krull-Schmidt category, it is possible to choose a right minimal version of f_X and then the resulting triangle is unique up to isomorphism (see 4.2-4.3 in [5] for information about right and left minimal morphisms in a Krull-Schmidt category).

Lemma 3.2. *Let $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D})$ be a torsion pair in $\mathcal{T}$, and consider a triangle $C \xrightarrow{f} X \xrightarrow{g} D \xrightarrow{h}$. The following are equivalent*

(1) *$C \in \mathcal{C}$ and f is a minimal right $\mathcal{C}$-approximation;*
(2) *$D \in \mathcal{D}$ and g is a minimal left $\mathcal{D}$-approximation.*

Proof. (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2): Since $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D})$ is a torsion pair, we have a triangle $C_X \xrightarrow{f_X} X \xrightarrow{g_X} D_X \to$ with $C_X \in \mathcal{C}$ and $D_X \in \mathcal{D}$. As f_X and f are both right $\mathcal{C}$-approximations, we must have $C_X \cong C \oplus C'$ with $f_X|_{C'} = 0$. It follows that $D_X \cong D \oplus C'[1]$, whence $D \in \mathcal{D}$. Furthermore, if g is not left minimal, D contains a direct summand D' on which h restricts to an isomorphism. It follows that C has a direct summand, isomorphic to $D'[-1]$ on which f restricts to 0, but this contradicts the minimality of f. The converse is proved analogously. □

We call a triangle of the form $C \xrightarrow{f} X \xrightarrow{g} D \to$ with f a minimal right $\mathcal{C}$-approximation a *minimal $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D})$-triangle* for X. By choosing a right minimal version of f_X in the triangle in (TP2), we know that any X admits a minimal $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D})$-triangle. Moreover, since a minimal right $\mathcal{C}$-approximation is unique up to isomorphism, so is the resulting triangle. Furthermore, notice that a $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D})$-triangle is necessarily minimal if C (resp. D) is indecomposable and f (resp. g) is nonzero.

Fixing a torsion pair $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D})$ in $\mathcal{T}$, we can now define operators $\mathbf{a}$ and $\mathbf{b}$ on $\mathrm{ob}(T)$ via a minimal $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D})$-triangle $C_X \xrightarrow{f_X} X \xrightarrow{g_X} D_X \to$ for X by $\mathbf{a}(X) = C_X$ and $\mathbf{b}(X) = D_X$. These are not functors in general, but in certain cases they become functorial if we restrict to an appropriate subcategory (see the remarks following Lemma 4.7). Notice, additionally, that they are functorial if one assumes $\mathcal{C}[1] \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}[-1] \subseteq \mathcal{D}$ as in the definition of torsion theory given by Beligiannis and Reiten [3]. Moreover, under these assumptions any $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D})$-triangle is automatically minimal.

It is not hard to produce subcategories of $\mathcal{T}$ satisfying the orthogonality conditions (TP1'). For instance, start with any $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$, and set $\mathcal{C} = {}^{\perp}(\mathcal{X}^{\perp})$ and $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{X}^{\perp}$. It is then routine to check that $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{C}^{\perp}$. It is an interesting problem to determine which subsets $\mathcal{X}$ of $\mathcal{T}$ will actually produce a torsion pair in this way. Aihara and Iyama show that this is the case if $\mathcal{T}$ has arbitrary coproducts and $\mathcal{X}$ consists of compact objects [1], but we cannot assume $\mathcal{T}$ has arbitrary coproducts if we want our theory to apply to the stable category of finitely generated modules over a self-injective algebra. Similarly, one could take $\mathcal{C} = {}^{\perp}\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{D} = ({}^{\perp}\mathcal{X})^{\perp}$ to get another pair of subcategories satisfying (TP1'). We also point out that both $({}^{\perp}\mathcal{X})^{\perp}$ and ${}^{\perp}(\mathcal{X}^{\perp})$ are extension-closed subcategories containing $\mathcal{X}$, and hence they both contain $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{X})$. It is natural to wonder when equality might hold. The following theorem answers both of these questions affirmatively in a special case.

Theorem 3.3. *Suppose $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ for a simple-minded system $\mathcal{S}$ in $\mathcal{T}$. Then $({}^{\perp}\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{X}))$ and $(\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{X}), \mathcal{X}^{\perp})$ are torsion pairs in $\mathcal{T}$. In particular, $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{X})$ is a functorially finite subcategory of $\mathcal{T}$.*

Proof. As we have already observed, the pair $({}^{\perp}\mathcal{X}, ({}^{\perp}\mathcal{X})^{\perp})$ satisfies (TP1'). We will check (TP2) for $X \in (\mathcal{S})_n$ by induction on n. Simultaneously, we will see that $\mathbf{b}(X) \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{X})$. If $n = 1$, then we use the triangle $0 \longrightarrow X \xrightarrow{1} X \to$ if $X \in \mathcal{X}$, or the triangle $X \xrightarrow{1} X \longrightarrow 0 \to$ if $X \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{X}$. Now assume that a $({}^{\perp}\mathcal{X}, ({}^{\perp}\mathcal{X})^{\perp})$-triangle exists for every $Y \in (\mathcal{S})_{n-1}$, and moreover that $\mathbf{b}(Y) \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{X})$ for all such Y. If $X \in {}^{\perp}\mathcal{X}$, there is nothing to prove. Thus we may assume, using Lemma 2.6, that there is a triangle $Y \longrightarrow X \xrightarrow{f} S_i \to$ with $S_i \in \mathcal{X}$ and $Y \in (\mathcal{S})_{n-1}$. By the induction hypothesis and the octahedral axiom, we have a commutative diagram where the rows and columns are triangles.

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathbf{a}Y \arrow[r, equal] \arrow[d] & \mathbf{a}Y \arrow[d] & & \\
Y \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & X \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & S_i \arrow[r] \arrow[d, equal] & {} \\
\mathbf{b}Y \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & W \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & S_i \arrow[r] & {} \\
{} & {} & &
\end{tikzcd}$$

The bottom row shows that $W \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{X})$, and the second column yields the desired triangle for X. Moreover, $\mathbf{b}X$ is isomorphic to a direct summand of W and thus belongs to $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{X})$ by Lemma 2.7. Finally, if $X \in ({}^{\perp}\mathcal{X})^{\perp}$, then $X \cong \mathbf{b}X \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{X})$, and it follows that $({}^{\perp}\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{X})) = ({}^{\perp}\mathcal{X}, ({}^{\perp}\mathcal{X})^{\perp})$ is a torsion pair. The proof that $(\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{X}), \mathcal{X}^{\perp})$ is a torsion pair is entirely analogous. □

In much of what follows, we will assume that $\mathcal{T}$ has *Serre duality*, meaning that there is an exact autoequivalence $\nu : \mathcal{T} \to \mathcal{T}$, called a *Serre functor*, together with natural isomorphisms $\mathcal{T}(X, Y) \cong D\mathcal{T}(Y, \nu X)$ for all $X, Y \in \mathcal{T}$, where $D = \mathrm{Hom}_k(-, k)$ is the standard duality with respect to the ground field k.

Lemma 3.4. *Assume $\mathcal{T}$ has a Serre functor ν. Then, for any $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$, we have $\mathcal{X}^{\perp} = \nu({}^{\perp}\mathcal{X})$ and $({}^{\perp}\mathcal{X})^{\perp} = {}^{\perp}(\mathcal{X}^{\perp})$.*

Proof. Let $X \in \mathcal{X}$. Since $\mathcal{T}(Y, X) = 0$ if and only if $\mathcal{T}(X, \nu Y) = 0$, we see that $Y \in {}^{\perp}\mathcal{X}$ if and only if $\nu Y \in \mathcal{X}^{\perp}$. Applying this identity to ${}^{\perp}\mathcal{X}$, we get $({}^{\perp}\mathcal{X})^{\perp} = \nu({}^{\perp}({}^{\perp}\mathcal{X})) = {}^{\perp}\nu({}^{\perp}\mathcal{X}) = {}^{\perp}(\mathcal{X}^{\perp})$. □

4. MUTATION OF SIMPLE-MINDED SYSTEMS

We now focus on simple-minded systems and the associated torsion pairs in triangulated categories with Serre duality. Thus, from now on we assume that ν is a Serre functor for $\mathcal{T}$, that $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ is a simple-minded system with $\nu(\mathcal{S}[1]) = \mathcal{S}$ and that $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ also satisfies $\nu(\mathcal{X}[1]) = \mathcal{X}$. From Theorem 3.3, we have two torsion pairs $({}^{\perp}\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{X}))$ and $(\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{X}), \mathcal{X}^{\perp})$, and we define $\mathbf{a} : \mathcal{T} \to {}^{\perp}\mathcal{X}$, $\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c} : \mathcal{T} \to \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{X})$ and $\mathbf{d} : \mathcal{T} \to \mathcal{X}^{\perp}$ via the minimal triangles

$$\mathbf{a}X \to X \to \mathbf{b}X \to \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{c}X \to X \to \mathbf{d}X \to$$

corresponding to these two torsion pairs respectively. Additionally, we set $\alpha = \mathbf{a} \circ [-1]$ and $\beta = \mathbf{d} \circ [1]$. We begin by defining mutations of simple-minded systems, generalizing our previous definition from [4].

Definition 4.1. *With the notation and assumptions above, we define the* **left mutation of $\mathcal{S}$ at $\mathcal{X}$** *to be*

$$\mu^{+}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{S}) = \mathcal{X} \cup \{\alpha S_i \mid S_i \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{X}\}.$$

Dually, we define the **right mutation of $\mathcal{S}$ at $\mathcal{X}$** *to be*

$$\mu^{-}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{S}) = \mathcal{X} \cup \{\beta S_i \mid S_i \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{X}\}.$$

For $S_i \in \mathcal{S}$, we may also use $\mu^{+}_{\mathcal{X}}(S_i)$ to denote either S_i or αS_i, respectively, depending on whether or not $S_i \in \mathcal{X}$, and similarly for $\mu^{-}_{\mathcal{X}}(S_i)$.

Remark. In [9] (see also [7]), Koenig and Yang define mutation for *simple-minded collections*, which can be viewed as the derived category analogues of simple-minded systems. Their definition suggests a mutation of simple-minded systems that differs from ours by an application of the suspension functor: namely, $\mu^{+}_{\mathcal{X}}(S_i) = S_i[1]$ if $S_i \in \mathcal{X}$, while $\mu^{+}_{\mathcal{X}}(S_j)$ is defined to be the cone of the left $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{X})$ approximation of $S_j[-1]$ if $S_j \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{X}$ (see (5.3)). In analogy with the mutation of quivers, this latter definition is more logical: mutating a quiver at a single vertex is a local operation, affecting the arrows in a neighborhood of that vertex and leaving the farther reaches of the quiver unchanged. Likewise this definition of mutation of simple-minded systems replaces the "simples" in $\mathcal{X}$ with their suspensions and will have no affect on the "simples" that are "sufficiently far" from those in $\mathcal{X}$. However, we have opted for our alternate definition here as it is more convenient for computing examples: especially, if $\mathcal{X}$ is large, in which case we only need to compute the affect of mutating on the objects outside of $\mathcal{X}$. Moreover, we can apply our mutation procedure repeatedly with respect to the same subset $\mathcal{X}$ using a single torsion pair.

The following theorem represents the main result of this section. It answers a question raised in [4] and provides a useful way of obtaining many nontrivial examples of simple-minded systems in stable categories.

Theorem 4.2. *Suppose $\mathcal{S}$ is a simple-minded system in $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ satisfies $\nu(\mathcal{X}[1]) = \mathcal{X}$. Then $\mu^+_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{S})$ and $\mu^-_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{S})$ are simple-minded systems in $\mathcal{T}$.*

The proof will be completed in several steps. We begin with some simple observations.

Lemma 4.3. *Assume $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ satisfies $\nu(\mathcal{X}[1]) = \mathcal{X}$. Then $\nu(\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{X})[1]) = \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{X})$. Furthermore, $\nu(\mathbf{a}X)[1] \cong \mathbf{a}(\nu X[1])$ and $\nu(\mathbf{b}X)[1] \cong \mathbf{b}(\nu X[1])$ for all $X \in \mathcal{T}$, and similarly for $\mathbf{c}$ and $\mathbf{d}$.*

Proof. We show that $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{X}) \subseteq \nu(\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{X})[1])$, as the proof of the reverse inclusion is similar. For $X \in (\mathcal{X})_n$, we will prove that $X \in \nu(\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{X})[1])$ by induction on n. If $n = 1$, then $X \in \mathcal{X} = \nu(\mathcal{X}[1]) \subseteq \nu(\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{X})[1])$. Now assume that $(\mathcal{X})_{n-1} \subseteq \nu(\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{X})[1])$ for some $n \geq 2$. If $X \in (\mathcal{X})_n$, we have a triangle $X' \to X \to S_i \to$ with $X' \in (\mathcal{X})_{n-1} \subseteq \nu(\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{X})[1])$ and $S_i \in \mathcal{X} = \nu(\mathcal{X}[1])$. Thus, we also have a triangle $\nu^{-1}(X')[-1] \to \nu^{-1}(X)[-1] \to \nu^{-1}(S_i)[-1] \to$, which shows that $\nu^{-1}(X)[-1] \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{X})$, and thus that $X \in \nu(\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{X})[1])$.

Now consider a triangle $\mathbf{a}X \to X \to \mathbf{b}X \to$, to which we can apply the exact functor $\nu \circ -[1]$. Noting that $\nu((\mathbf{a}X)[1]) \in {}^{\perp}\nu(\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{X})[1]) = {}^{\perp}\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{X})$, we see that the resulting triangle is isomorphic to $\mathbf{a}(\nu X[1]) \to \nu X[1] \to \mathbf{b}(\nu X[1]) \to$. □

Lemma 4.4. *For any $M \in {}^{\perp}\mathcal{X}^{\perp}$, we have $\beta\alpha M \cong M \cong \alpha\beta M$.*

Proof. We may assume that M is indecomposable. By definition of α, we have a minimal triangle $\alpha M \xrightarrow{f} M[-1] \to \mathbf{b}(M[-1]) \to$. Notice that $f \neq 0$ since $M[-1] \in {}^{\perp}(\mathcal{X}[-1]) = {}^{\perp}(\nu\mathcal{X}) = \mathcal{X}^{\perp}$ implies that $M[-1] \notin \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{X})$. Rotating this triangle to the right twice yields another triangle $\mathbf{b}(M[-1]) \to (\alpha M)[1] \xrightarrow{f[1]} M \to$, which is again minimal since M is indecomposable and $f[1] \neq 0$. Since $\mathbf{b}(M[-1]) \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{X})$ and $M \in \mathcal{X}^{\perp}$, we must have $M \cong \mathbf{d}((\alpha M)[1]) = \beta\alpha M$. The other identity is proved similarly. □

Since any $S_i \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{X}$ belongs to ${}^{\perp}\mathcal{X}^{\perp}$, we obtain the following corollary, which shows that left and right mutation are mutually inverse operations. We point out that the operation $\mu^-_{\mathcal{X}}$ (resp. $\mu^+_{\mathcal{X}}$) is still defined on $\mu^+_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{S})$ (resp. on $\mu^-_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{S})$) even without knowing that the latter is a simple-minded system.

Corollary 4.5. *Let $\mathcal{S}$ be a simple-minded system and suppose that $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ satisfies $\nu(\mathcal{X}[1]) = \mathcal{X}$. Then*

$$\mu^-_{\mathcal{X}}(\mu^+_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{S})) = \mathcal{S} = \mu^+_{\mathcal{X}}(\mu^-_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{S})).$$

Lemma 4.6. *For any triangle $\mathbf{a}M \xrightarrow{f} M \xrightarrow{g} \mathbf{b}M \to$ and any $X \in \mathcal{X}$, we have*

(a) *The map $\mathcal{T}(g, X) : \mathcal{T}(\mathbf{b}M, X) \to \mathcal{T}(M, X)$ is an isomorphism;*
(b) *The map $\mathcal{T}(X, f) : \mathcal{T}(X, \mathbf{a}M) \to \mathcal{T}(X, M)$ is a monomorphism;*
(c) *If $M \in \mathcal{X}^{\perp}$, then $\mathbf{a}M \in {}^{\perp}\mathcal{X}^{\perp}$.*

Proof. (a) Since g is a left $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{X})$-approximation, we know that $\mathcal{T}(g, X)$ is onto. To see that it is one-to-one, suppose we have a map $h : \mathbf{b}M \to X$ such that $hg = 0$. By the octahedral axiom we have a commutative diagram where the rows and columns are triangles.

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & M \arrow[r, equal] \arrow[d, "g"] & M \arrow[d, "0"] & \\
Y \arrow[r] \arrow[d, equal] & \mathbf{b}M \arrow[r, "h"] \arrow[d] & X \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & {} \\
Y \arrow[r] & (\mathbf{a}M)[1] \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & X \oplus M[1] \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & {} \\
 & {} & {} &
\end{tikzcd}$$

Twice rotating the bottom triangle to the left yields a triangle $\mathbf{a}M \to X[-1] \oplus M \to Y \to$ where $Y \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{X})$ by Lemma 2.6. Thus $\mathbf{a}(X[-1]) = 0$ implies that $X[-1] \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{X})$, and hence $Y \cong X[-1] \oplus \mathbf{b}M$, which forces $h = 0$.

(b) Since $\mathcal{T}(g, X)$ is injective, $\mathcal{T}(f[1], X)$ must be surjective. We fix an isomorphism $h : \mathbf{a}(\nu M[1]) \to \nu(\mathbf{a}M)[1]$ by Lemma 4.3, and we obtain a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathcal{T}(M[1], X) \arrow[r, "\mathcal{T}(f[1]{,}X)"] \arrow[d, "\nu", "\cong"'] & \mathcal{T}((\mathbf{a}M)[1], X) \arrow[d, "\nu", "\cong"'] \\
\mathcal{T}(\nu M[1], \nu X) \arrow[r, "\mathcal{T}(\nu f[1]{,}\nu X)"] \arrow[d, equal] & \mathcal{T}(\nu(\mathbf{a}M)[1], \nu X) \arrow[d, "\mathcal{T}(h{,}\nu X)", "\cong"'] \\
\mathcal{T}(\nu M[1], \nu X) \arrow[r, "\mathcal{T}(\nu f[1]\circ h{,}\nu X)"] \arrow[d, "\cong"'] & \mathcal{T}(\mathbf{a}(\nu M[1]), \nu X) \arrow[d, "\cong"'] \\
D\mathcal{T}(X, \nu M[1]) \arrow[r, "D\mathcal{T}(X{,}\nu f[1]\circ h)"] & D\mathcal{T}(X, \mathbf{a}(\nu M[1])).
\end{tikzcd}$$

Since the morphism on the bottom is surjective, the map $\mathcal{T}(X, \nu f[1] \circ h)$ must be injective. This establishes (b) for the object $\nu M[1]$ (in place of M), but every object of $\mathcal{T}$ arises in this way.

(c) This is an immediate consequence of (b). □

For convenience, we state the dual of Lemma 4.6 without proof.

Lemma 4.7. *For any triangle* $\mathbf{c}M \xrightarrow{f} M \xrightarrow{g} \mathbf{d}M \to$ *and any* $X \in \mathcal{X}$*, we have*

(a) *The map* $\mathcal{T}(X, f) : \mathcal{T}(X, \mathbf{c}M) \to \mathcal{T}(X, M)$ *is an isomorphism;*
(b) *The map* $\mathcal{T}(g, X) : \mathcal{T}(\mathbf{d}M, X) \to \mathcal{T}(M, X)$ *is a monomorphism;*
(c) *If* $M \in {}^{\perp}\mathcal{X}$*, then* $\mathbf{d}M \in {}^{\perp}\mathcal{X}^{\perp}$*.*

Observe that, as a consequence of the two previous lemmas along with Lemma 3.4, $\alpha : {}^{\perp}\mathcal{X} \to {}^{\perp}\mathcal{X}^{\perp}$ and $\beta : \mathcal{X}^{\perp} \to {}^{\perp}\mathcal{X}^{\perp}$. In fact, α and β are functors when restricted to these subcategories. To see this, it suffices to check that $\mathbf{a} : \mathcal{X}^{\perp} \to {}^{\perp}\mathcal{X}^{\perp}$ and $\mathbf{d} : {}^{\perp}\mathcal{X} \to {}^{\perp}\mathcal{X}^{\perp}$ are well-defined on morphisms. For $\mathbf{a}$, this follows from the fact that $\mathcal{T}(\mathbf{a}M, (\mathbf{b}N)[-1]) \cong D\mathcal{T}(\nu^{-1}(\mathbf{b}N)[-1], \mathbf{a}M) \cong D\mathcal{T}(\mathbf{b}(\nu^{-1}N[-1]), \mathbf{a}M) = 0$, as $\mathbf{a}M \in {}^{\perp}\mathcal{X}^{\perp}$. The argument for $\mathbf{d}$ is similar.

Proposition 4.8. *Suppose* $\mathcal{S}$ *is a simple-minded system with* $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ *satisfying* $\nu(\mathcal{X}[1]) = \nu$*. Then* $\mu^{+}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{S})$ *and* $\mu^{-}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{S})$ *are sets of orthogonal bricks in* $\mathcal{T}$*.*

Proof. We only provide the proof for $\mu^{+}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{S})$, as the proof for $\mu^{-}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{S})$ is similar. First notice that $\alpha S_i \in {}^{\perp}\mathcal{X}^{\perp}$ for all $S_i \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{X}$ by the above remarks. The rest of our proof is modeled on the proof of Theorem 6.2 in [4].

Suppose that $S_i, S_j \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{X}$, and consider the exact diagram obtained by applying $\mathcal{T}(\alpha S_j, -)$ and $\mathcal{T}(-, S_i[-1])$ to the triangles defining αS_i and αS_j respectively.

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & & \mathcal{T}(\mathbf{b}(S_j[-1])[-1], S_i[-1]) & \\
\mathcal{T}(\alpha S_j, \mathbf{b}(S_i[-1])[-1]) \arrow[r, "0"] & \mathcal{T}(\alpha S_j, \alpha S_i) \arrow[r] & \mathcal{T}(\alpha S_j, S_i[-1]) \arrow[r, "0"] \arrow[u, "0"] & \mathcal{T}(\alpha S_j, \mathbf{b}(S_i[-1])) \\
 & & \mathcal{T}(S_j[-1], S_i[-1]) \arrow[u] & \\
 & & \mathcal{T}(\mathbf{b}(S_j[-1]), S_i[-1]) \arrow[u, "0"] &
\end{tikzcd}$$

To get the zero maps we have used that $\mathcal{T}(\alpha S_j, \mathbf{b}(S_i[-1])[-1]) \cong \mathcal{T}(\alpha S_j, \nu\mathbf{b}(\nu^{-1}S_i[-2])) \cong D\mathcal{T}(\mathbf{b}(\nu^{-1}S_i[-2]), \alpha S_j) = 0$ and $\mathcal{T}(\alpha S_j, \mathbf{b}(S_i[-1])) = 0$ since $\alpha S_j \in {}^{\perp}\mathcal{X}^{\perp}$; that $\mathcal{T}(\mathbf{b}(S_j[-1])[-1], S_i[-1]) \cong \mathcal{T}(\mathbf{b}(S_j[-1]), S_i) = 0$ since $S_i \in {}^{\perp}\mathcal{X}^{\perp}$; and that $\mathcal{T}(\mathbf{b}(S_j[-1]), S_i[-1]) \cong D\mathcal{T}(\nu^{-1}(S_i[-1]), \mathbf{b}(S_j[-1])) = 0$ since $\nu^{-1}(S_i[-1]) \in \nu^{-1}({}^{\perp}\mathcal{X}^{\perp}[-1]) = {}^{\perp}\mathcal{X}^{\perp}$. Thus the remaining nonzero maps now yield isomorphisms

$$\mathcal{T}(\alpha S_j, \alpha S_i) \cong \mathcal{T}(\alpha S_j, S_i[-1]) \cong \mathcal{T}(S_j[-1], S_i[-1]) \cong \mathcal{T}(S_j, S_i) \cong k^{\delta_{ij}}. \square$$

We need two additional lemmas in order to prove Theorem 4.2.

Lemma 4.9. *For any $N \in {}^{\perp}\mathcal{X}$, αN is a direct summand of $\alpha\mathbf{d}N$.*

Proof. By definition of α we have a triangle $\alpha N \to N[-1] \to \mathbf{b}(N[-1]) \to$. Rotating to the right now yields the triangle in the top row below.

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathbf{b}(N[-1]) \arrow[r] \arrow[d, dashed] & \alpha N[1] \arrow[r] \arrow[d, equal] & N \arrow[r] \arrow[d, dashed, "\varphi"] & \mathbf{b}(N[-1])[1] \arrow[r] \arrow[d, dashed] & {} \\
\mathbf{c}((\alpha N)[1]) \arrow[r, "g"'] & (\alpha N)[1] \arrow[r] & \beta\alpha N \arrow[r] & \mathbf{c}((\alpha N)[1])[1] \arrow[r] & {}
\end{tikzcd}$$

The triangle in the second row is that used to define $\beta\alpha N$, and the morphism of triangles exists since $\mathbf{b}(N[-1]) \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{X})$ while g is a right $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{X})$-approximation. Applying the inverse of the suspension functor to the diagram now yields the morphism of triangles.

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\alpha N \arrow[r] \arrow[d, equal] & N[-1] \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\varphi[-1]"] & \mathbf{b}(N[-1]) \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & {} \\
\alpha N \arrow[r] & (\beta\alpha N)[-1] \arrow[r] & \mathbf{c}(\alpha N[1]) \arrow[r] & {}
\end{tikzcd}$$

Since $\alpha N \in {}^{\perp}\mathcal{X}$ while $\mathbf{b}(N[-1]), \mathbf{c}(\alpha N[1]) \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{X})$, these are both $({}^{\perp}\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{X}))$-triangles. Moreover, they are minimal since $\alpha N \in {}^{\perp}\mathcal{X}^{\perp}$, which forces $(\alpha N)[1] \in {}^{\perp}\mathcal{X}^{\perp}[1] = \nu^{-1}({}^{\perp}\mathcal{X}^{\perp}) \subseteq {}^{\perp}\mathcal{X}$. Consequently, we see that $\alpha(\varphi) = \mathbf{a}(\varphi[-1])$ is an isomorphism. Now let $f : N \to \mathbf{d}N$ be a minimal left $\mathcal{X}^{\perp}$-approximation. Since $\beta\alpha N \in \mathcal{X}^{\perp}$, φ must factor through f. As $\mathbf{d}N$ also belongs to ${}^{\perp}\mathcal{X}^{\perp} \subseteq {}^{\perp}\mathcal{X}$, the isomorphism $\alpha(\varphi)$ factors through $\alpha(f)$, which forces $\alpha(f)$ to be a split monomorphism. $\square$

Lemma 4.10. *Suppose that $L \xrightarrow{f} M \xrightarrow{g} N \xrightarrow{h}$ is a triangle with $N \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{X})$ and $L \in \mathcal{X}^{\perp}$. Then $\mathbf{a}L \cong \mathbf{a}M$.*

Proof. Let $i_L : \mathbf{a}L \to L$ and $i_M : \mathbf{a}M \to M$ be the natural maps. Since $N \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{X})$, we have $gi_M = 0$ and thus i_M factors through f. Since $\mathbf{a}M \in {}^{\perp}\mathcal{X}$, we see that i_M factors through fi_L. Thus fi_L is a right ${}^{\perp}\mathcal{X}$-approximation of M. We claim that fi_L is right minimal. Otherwise, there is a nonzero direct summand L' of $\mathbf{a}L$ for which $fi_L|_{L'} = 0$, which implies that $i_L|_{L'}$ factors through the map $h[-1] : N[-1] \to L$. However, $\mathcal{T}(L', N[-1]) \cong D\mathcal{T}(\nu^{-1}N[-1], L') = 0$ as $\mathbf{a}L$, and hence L', belongs to ${}^{\perp}\mathcal{X}^{\perp}$ by Lemma 4.6(c) and $\nu^{-1}N[-1] \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{X})$ by Lemma 4.3. This implies that $i_L|_{L'} = 0$, contradicting the minimality of i_L. Thus

fi_L is a minimal right ${}^{\perp}\mathcal{X}$-approximation of M, and we have $\mathbf{a}M \cong \mathbf{a}L$. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 4.2. In light of Proposition 4.8, it only remains to show that $\mathcal{F}(\mu^+_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{S})) = \mathcal{T}$. We begin by showing that $\alpha({}^{\perp}\mathcal{X}^{\perp}) \subseteq \mathcal{F}(\mu^+_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{S}))$ by induction on the $\mathcal{S}$-length of an object in ${}^{\perp}\mathcal{X}^{\perp}$. If $M \in {}^{\perp}\mathcal{X}^{\perp} \cap (\mathcal{S})_1$, then $M \cong S_i \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{X}$ and $\alpha M \cong \alpha S_i \in (\mu^+_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{S}))_1$. Now suppose that $\alpha N \in \mathcal{F}(\mu^+_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{S}))$ for all $N \in {}^{\perp}\mathcal{X}^{\perp} \cap (\mathcal{S})_{n-1}$, and let $M \in {}^{\perp}\mathcal{X}^{\perp} \cap (\mathcal{S})_n$. We can find a triangle $S_i \xrightarrow{f} M \xrightarrow{g} N \to$ with $S_i \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{X}$, $f \neq 0$ and $N \in (\mathcal{S})_{n-1}$. Since $M, S_i[1] \in {}^{\perp}X$, we must have $N \in {}^{\perp}\mathcal{X}$ as well. In particular, Lemma 4.9 shows that $\alpha N \in \mathcal{F}(\mu^+_{X}(\mathcal{S}))$ since $\mathbf{d}N \in {}^{\perp}\mathcal{X}^{\perp} \cap (\mathcal{S})_{n-1}$ and $\mathcal{F}(\mu^+_{X}(\mathcal{S}))$ is closed under direct summands thanks to Proposition 4.8 and Lemma 2.7.

If α were an exact functor on ${}^{\perp}\mathcal{X}$, we would now be done. Unfortunately, α is typically not exact. Instead, we construct a triangle $L \to \alpha M \to \alpha N \to$ with $L \in \mathcal{F}(\mu^+_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{S}))$ as follows. First, we use the octahedral axiom to obtain a commutative diagram in which the rows and columns are triangles.

$$\begin{tikzcd}
S_i[-1] \arrow[r] \arrow[d, equal] & M' \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & \alpha N \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & {} \\
S_i[-1] \arrow[r, "{f[-1]}"] & M[-1] \arrow[r, "{g[-1]}"] \arrow[d] & N[-1] \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & {} \\
 & \mathbf{b}(N[-1]) \arrow[r, equal] \arrow[d] & \mathbf{b}(N[-1]) \arrow[d] & \\
 & {} & {} &
\end{tikzcd}$$

Since $N, S_i \in {}^{\perp}\mathcal{X}$, we know that $\alpha N \in {}^{\perp}\mathcal{X}^{\perp}$ and $S_i[-1] \in \mathcal{X}^{\perp}$, and thus the triangle in the top row shows that $M' \in \mathcal{X}^{\perp}$. By Lemma 4.10, we have $\mathbf{a}M' \cong \mathbf{a}(M[-1]) = \alpha M$. Applying the octahedral axiom again we have the commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
L \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & \alpha M \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & \alpha N \arrow[r] \arrow[d, equal] & {} \\
S_i[-1] \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & M' \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & \alpha N \arrow[r] & {} \\
\mathbf{b}M' \arrow[r, equal] \arrow[d] & \mathbf{b}M' \arrow[d] & & \\
{} & {} & &
\end{tikzcd}$$

which yields the desired triangle $L \to \alpha M \to \alpha N \to$ as its top row. Moreover, this triangle shows that $L \in \mathcal{X}^{\perp}$ since $\alpha M, \alpha N \in {}^{\perp}\mathcal{X}^{\perp}$ and thus $(\alpha N)[-1] \in {}^{\perp}\mathcal{X}^{\perp}[-1] = \nu({}^{\perp}\mathcal{X}^{\perp}) \subseteq \mathcal{X}^{\perp}$. Now applying Lemma 4.10 to the triangle in the first column shows that $\mathbf{a}L \cong \mathbf{a}(S_i[-1]) = \alpha S_i$. In particular, we have a triangle $\alpha S_i \to L \to \mathbf{b}L \to$, showing that $L \in \mathcal{F}(\mu^+_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{S}))$. It follows that $\alpha M \in \mathcal{F}(\mu^+_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{S}))$, completing the induction argument.

Finally, we know that $\mathcal{T} = {}^{\perp}\mathcal{X} * \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{X})$, while ${}^{\perp}\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{X}) * {}^{\perp}\mathcal{X}^{\perp}$ by Lemma 4.7. Since ${}^{\perp}\mathcal{X}^{\perp}$ and $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{X})$ are contained in $\mathcal{F}(\mu^+_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{S}))$, it follows that $\mathcal{T}$ is as well. $\square$

5. OKUYAMA COMPLEXES

We now set out to show that mutation of simple-minded systems inside stable module categories corresponds to the derived equivalences induced by Okuyama complexes, generalizing the main theorem from [4]. We start by fixing our notation. Let Λ be a basic self-injective algebra over an algebraically closed field k, and set $\mathcal{S} = \{S_1, \ldots, S_n\}$, a complete set of representatives of the isomorphism classes of the simple (right)

Λ-modules. We also write $P_i = e_i\Lambda$ for the indecomposable projective and primitive idempotent corresponding to S_i, and for any subset $U \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ we will write $e_U = \sum_{S_i \in U} e_i$, $P_U = e_U\Lambda$ and $Q_U = (1 - e_U)\Lambda$. We let $\mathcal{N} = D\mathrm{Hom}_\Lambda(-, \Lambda)$ denote the Nakayama functor, which induces an auto equivalence of $\underline{\mathrm{mod}}$-Λ and satisfies $\mathcal{N} \cong \nu\Omega^{-1}$, where ν is the Serre functor for $\underline{\mathrm{mod}}$-Λ and Ω is the syzygy functor. Thus we can mutate $\mathcal{S}$ with respect to any subset $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathcal{S}$ that is invariant under $\mathcal{N}$. Furthermore, corresponding to any such subset of $\mathcal{S}$ we have an Okuyama tilting complex $T_\mathcal{X} \in K^b(\text{proj-}\Lambda)$ given by $T_\mathcal{X} = \oplus_{i=1}^n T_i$ where

$$T_i \quad = \quad \begin{cases} P_i[-1], & \text{if } i \notin \mathcal{X} \\ \underline{P_i} \to L_i, & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{X} \end{cases} \tag{5.1}$$

with the maps $P_i \to L_i$ being minimal left $\mathrm{add}(Q_\mathcal{X})$-approximations, and with P_i underlined to signify that it is the degree 0 term of this complex. The assumption that $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{X}) = \mathcal{X}$ ensures that $T_\mathcal{X}$ is a tilting complex. We thus set $\Gamma = \mathrm{End}_{K^b(\Lambda)}(T_\mathcal{X})$, which is called the *tilting mutation* $\mu_\mathcal{X}^+(\Lambda)$ in [4]. We write $F : D^b(\text{mod-}\Gamma) \to D^b(\text{mod-}\Lambda)$ for the induced derived equivalence and $\underline{F} : \underline{\mathrm{mod}}\text{-}\Gamma \to \underline{\mathrm{mod}}\text{-}\Lambda$ for the induced stable equivalence as given by [12, 6]. We can now state the main result of this section.

Theorem 5.1 (Cf. Theorem 4.1 in [4])**.** *With the notation and assumptions above, $\underline{F}$ takes the set of simple Γ-modules to $\mu_\mathcal{X}^+(\mathcal{S})$ in $\underline{mod}$-Λ.*

The proof relies mainly on recent work of Koenig and Yang [9] connecting mutation of simple-minded collections in $D^b(\text{mod-}\Lambda)$ to the mutation of silting objects (recently studied by Aihara and Iyama [1]) in $K^b(\text{proj-}\Lambda)$. Thus we begin by reviewing the relevant definitions and results that we will need. We will continue to write $\mathcal{N}$ for the auto-equivalences induced by the Nakayama functor on $K^b(\text{proj-}\Lambda)$ and on $D^b(\text{mod-}\Lambda)$. In fact, $\mathcal{N}$ is a Serre functor for these categories.

We say that an object M in a triangulated category $\mathcal{T}$ is a *silting object* if $\mathrm{add}(M)$ generates $\mathcal{T}$ (as a triangulated category) and $\mathcal{T}(M, M[i]) = 0$ for all $i > 0$. Aihara and Iyama introduced a mutation procedure for silting objects in [1]. Namely, if $M = U \oplus V$ is a silting object in $\mathcal{T}$, then one obtains a new silting object $\mu_U^+(M)$ by replacing V with the cone N_V of a left $\mathrm{add}(U)$-approximation $V \xrightarrow{f} D$ in $\mathcal{T}$. That is, $\mu_U^+(M) = U \oplus N_V$. In case $\mathcal{T} = K^b(\text{proj-}\Lambda)$ for a self-injective algebra Λ, it is not difficult to see that any $\mathcal{N}$-stable silting object M (i.e., satisfying $\mathcal{N}(M) \cong M$) must be a tilting complex. Furthermore, if $\mathcal{N}(U) = U$ for a summand U of M, then the silting mutation $\mu_U^+(M)$ remains $\mathcal{N}$-stable and thus a tilting complex. In fact, as shown in Section 2.7 of [1], Okuyama tilting complexes are precisely those obtained by mutating Λ in this way. In our setting, one easily checks that the complex $T_\mathcal{X}$ described above is realized by mutating the tilting complex Λ at $P_\mathcal{X}$ and de-suspending:

$$T_\mathcal{X} \cong \mu_{P_\mathcal{X}}^+(\Lambda)[-1]. \tag{5.2}$$

In [9], Koenig and Yang define a mutation procedure for simple-minded collections (which were essentially introduced by Rickard in [13]), and show that it is compatible with mutation of silting objects in an appropriate sense. We say that a set of objects $\{X_1, \dots, X_r\} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ is a *simple-minded collection* if

- $\mathcal{T}(X_i, X_j[m]) = 0$ for all $m < 0$;
- $\mathcal{T}(X_i, X_j) = 0$ for all $i \neq j$ and $\mathcal{T}(X_i, X_i) \cong k$ for all i; and
- $X_1, \dots, X_n$ generate $\mathcal{T}$ as a triangulated category.

Clearly the set of simple Γ-modules $\mathcal{S}' = \{S_1', \dots, S_n'\}$ forms a simple-minded collection in $D^b(\text{mod-}\Gamma)$. Moreover, this simple-minded collection is $\mathcal{N}$-stable. Since $F : D^b(\text{mod-}\Gamma) \to D^b(\text{mod-}\Lambda)$ is an equivalence and commutes with $\mathcal{N}$ (up to isomorphism), we see that $F(\mathcal{S}') = \{F(S_1'), \dots, F(S_n')\}$ is an $\mathcal{N}$-stable simple-minded collection in $D^b(\text{mod-}\Lambda)$. In fact, Koenig and Yang have generalized this procedure to define a bijection ϕ_{21} from the set of equivalence classes of silting objects in $K^b(\text{proj-}\Lambda)$ to the set of equivalence classes of simple-minded collections in $D^b(\text{mod-}\Lambda)$ (here, two (sets of) objects are said to be 'equivalent' if they generate the same additive subcategory). Furthermore, in our setting where Λ is self-injective, they show that $\mathcal{N}$-stable simple-minded collections correspond to $\mathcal{N}$-stable silting complexes (see 6.6.2 in [9]), which are precisely the tilting complexes in $K^b(\text{proj-}\Lambda)$. Thus their map ϕ_{21} restricts to a bijection between the set of equivalence classes of tilting complexes in $K^b(\text{proj-}\Lambda)$ and the set of equivalence classes of $\mathcal{N}$-stable simple-minded collections in $D^b(\text{mod-}\Lambda)$. By construction this bijection commutes with the suspension functors of these two categories; i.e., $\phi_{21}(T[1]) \cong \phi_{21}(T)[1]$ for any tilting complex $T \in K^b(\text{proj-}\Lambda)$. The definition and main properties of the map ϕ_{21} that we need will be summarized in the theorem below.

While mutation for simple-minded collections does not work as universally as mutation for simple-minded collections, Koenig and Yang prove that the former mutations are always possible in the bounded derived category of a finite-dimensional algebra. While they prove this for mutations with respect to a single object of the simple-minded collection, the same definition and argument carry over to the setting of mutations with respect to any subset of the collection. Thus, modifying [9], for a simple-minded collection $X_1, \ldots, X_n \in D^b(\text{mod-}\Lambda)$ and $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \{X_1, \ldots, X_n\}$ we obtain another simple-minded collection consisting of the objects $\mu^+_{\mathcal{X}}(X_i)$ defined as follows:

$$\mu^+_{\mathcal{X}}(X_i) = \left\{ \begin{array}{rl} X_i[1], & \text{if } X_i \in \mathcal{X} \\ cone(X_i[-1] \xrightarrow{g_i} Y_i), & \text{if } X_i \notin \mathcal{X} \end{array} \right. \tag{5.3}$$

where the map g_i is a minimal left $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{X})$-approximation of $X_i[-1]$, and $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{X})$ is the extension-closure of $\mathcal{X}$ in $\mathcal{T} = D^b(\text{mod-}\Lambda)$. We can now summarize the results that we will use from [9], with part (4) corresponding to part of Theorem 8.11.

Theorem 5.2 (Koenig, Yang [9])**.** *Let $T \in K^b(\text{proj-}\Lambda)$ be a basic tilting complex and $F : D^b(\text{mod-}\mathrm{End}(T)) \to D^b(\text{mod-}\Lambda)$ the corresponding derived equivalence. Then the image of the set of simple $\mathrm{End}(T)$-modules under F is an $\mathcal{N}$ stable simple-minded collection in $D^b(\text{mod-}\Lambda)$, denoted $\phi_{21}(T)$. The map ϕ_{21} induces a bijection between the set of equivalence classes of basic tilting complexes in $K^b(\text{proj-}\Lambda)$ and the set of equivalence classes of $\mathcal{N}$-stable simple-minded collections in $D^b(\text{mod-}\Lambda)$, and satisfies:*

1. *$\phi_{21}(\Lambda) = \mathcal{S}$, the set of simple Λ-modules;*
2. *$\phi_{21}(T[1]) = \phi_{21}(T)[1]$;*
3. *There is a natural bijection between the indecomposable summands of T and the objects in $\phi_{21}(T)$;*
4. *For any direct summand U of T and the corresponding subset $\mathcal{X}$ of $\phi_{21}(T)$, we have*
$$\phi_{21}(\mu^+_U(T)) = \mu^+_{\mathcal{X}}(\phi_{21}(T)).$$

Corollary 5.3. *Let $\mathcal{S} = \{S_1, \ldots, S_n\} \subset \text{mod-}\Lambda \subset D^b(\text{mod-}\Lambda)$ be the simple-minded collection consisting of the set of simple Λ-modules. Assume $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ satisfies $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{X}) = \mathcal{X}$ and let $T_{\mathcal{X}}$ be the corresponding Okuyama tilting complex as in (5.1). Then the induced derived equivalence $F : D^b(\Gamma) \to D^b(\Lambda)$ sends the simple Γ-modules to $\mu^+_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{S})[-1]$.*

Proof. We have
$$F(\mathcal{S}') = \phi_{21}(T_{\mathcal{X}}) = \phi_{21}(\mu^+_{P_{\mathcal{X}}}(\Lambda)[-1]) = \mu^+_{\mathcal{X}}(\phi_{21}(\Lambda))[-1] = \mu^+_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{S})[-1]. \quad \square$$

Finally, we show that mutating the simples in $D^b(\text{mod-}\Lambda)$ lifts the corresponding mutation procedure in $\underline{\text{mod}}\text{-}\Lambda$ as defined in the previous section. We let $Q_\Lambda : D^b(\text{mod-}\Lambda) \to \underline{\text{mod}}\text{-}\Lambda$ denote the localization functor, which we write as Q when there is no ambiguity. It is exact and dense, and its restriction to mod-Λ is full.

Proposition 5.4. *For any $\mathcal{N}$-stable subset $\mathcal{X}$ of the set $\mathcal{S}$ of simple Λ-modules in $D^b(\text{mod-}\Lambda)$, we have $Q(\mu^+_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{S})) = \mu^+_{Q(\mathcal{X})}(Q(\mathcal{S}))[1]$.*

Proof. First, if $S_i \in \mathcal{X}$, then $Q(\mu^+_{\mathcal{X}}(S_i)) = Q(S_i[1]) = \mu^+_{Q(\mathcal{X})}(Q(S_i))[1]$ by definition. So we now assume that $S_i \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{X}$. By definition of $\mu^+_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{S})$, $D^b(\text{mod-}\Lambda)$ contains a triangle
$$\mu^+_{\mathcal{X}}(S_i)[-1] \longrightarrow S_i[-1] \xrightarrow{g_i} Y_i \longrightarrow \mu^+_{\mathcal{X}}(S_i)$$
where g_i is a minimal left $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{X})$-approximation. Since Q is exact, we also have a triangle
$$Q(\mu^+_{\mathcal{X}}(S_i))[-1] \longrightarrow Q(S_i[-1]) \xrightarrow{Q(g_i)} Q(Y_i) \longrightarrow Q(\mu^+_{\mathcal{X}}(S_i)) \tag{5.4}$$
in $\underline{\text{mod}}\text{-}\Lambda$. It thus remains to show that $Q(g_i)$ is a minimal left $\mathcal{F}(Q(\mathcal{X}))$-approximation.

We first show that $Q(Y_i) \in \mathcal{F}(Q(\mathcal{X}))$. Since $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathcal{S} \subset \text{mod-}\Lambda$, and the latter is extension-closed in $D^b(\text{mod-}\Lambda)$, the extension closure $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{X})$ of $\mathcal{X}$ will be contained in mod-Λ as well. In fact, it will consist of all the Λ-modules whose simple composition factors all belong to $\mathcal{X}$. Since Q takes short exact sequences in mod-Λ to distinguished triangles in $\underline{\text{mod}}\text{-}\Lambda$, it is clear that $Q(\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{X})) \subseteq \mathcal{F}(Q(\mathcal{X}))$. Moreover, equality must hold since any distinguished triangle $A \to B \xrightarrow{f} S \to$ in $\underline{\text{mod}}\text{-}\Lambda$ with S simple and $f \neq 0$ can be lifted to a short exact sequence $0 \to A \longrightarrow B \xrightarrow{f} S \to 0$ in mod-Λ.

Now suppose that $h : Q(S_i[-1]) \to M$ with $M \in \mathcal{F}(Q(\mathcal{X}))$. By the above remarks, we may write $M = Q(M')$ for some $M' \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{X})$. In order to lift h to a map in the derived category, we will replace $Q(S_i[-1])$ by $Q(\Omega S_i)$ as follows. The natural map $\varphi : S_i[-1] \to \Omega S_i$ in $D^b(\text{mod-}\Lambda)$ corresponding to the truncation of the degree-1 term of the projective resolution of $S_i[-1]$ induces an isomorphism $Q(\varphi) : Q(S_i[-1]) \to Q(\Omega S_i)$ in $\underline{\text{mod}}\text{-}\Lambda$. Thus we may find a map $f : \Omega S_i \to M'$ such that $Q(f) = hQ(\varphi)^{-1}$. Since g_i is a left $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{X})$-approximation, there exists a map $u : Y_i \to M'$ such that $f\varphi = ug_i$. Hence, applying Q now yields $h = Q(f)Q(\varphi) = Q(u)Q(g_i)$ as required. That $Q(g_i)$ is right minimal follows from the same assumption on g_i and the isomorphism $\text{Hom}_{D^b(\text{mod-}\Lambda)}(S_i[-1], Y_i) \cong \underline{\text{Hom}}_\Lambda(\Omega S_i, Y_i)$. The triangle (5.4) now shows that $Q(\mu^+_{\mathcal{X}}(S_i))[-1] \cong \mu^+_{\mathcal{X}}(Q(S_i))$. □

Proof of Theorem 5.1. By construction and the above results,

$$\underline{F}(Q_\Gamma(\mathcal{S}')) = Q_\Lambda(F(\mathcal{S}')) = Q_\Lambda(\mu^+_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{S})[-1]) = Q_\Lambda(\mu^+_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{S}))[-1] = \mu^+_{\mathcal{X}}(Q_\Lambda(\mathcal{S})). \quad \square$$

References

[1] T. Aihara and O. Iyama. *Silting mutation in triangulated categories.* Preprint (2010) arXiv:1009.3370v2.

[2] M. Auslander, I. Reiten, S. Smalø. *Representation theory of Artin algebras.* Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics 36, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1995.

[3] A. Beligiannis and I. Reiten. *Homological and homotopical aspects of torsion theories.* Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. 188 (2007), no. 883.

[4] A. Dugas. *Tilting mutation of weakly symmetric algebras and stable equivalence.* Preprint (2011) arXiv:1110.1679v1 [math.RT].

[5] A. Dugas and R. Martínez Villa. *Stable equivalences of graded algebras.* J. Algebra 320 (2008), no. 12, 4215-4241.

[6] W. Hu and C. Xi. *Derived equivalences and stable equivalences of Morita type, I.* Nagoya Math. J. 200 (2010) 107–152.

[7] B. Keller and D. Yang. *Derived equivalences from mutations of quivers with potential.* Adv. Math. 226 (2011) 2118–2168.

[8] S. Koenig and Y. Liu. *Simple-minded systems in stable module categories.* Preprint (2010) arXiv:1009.1427v1.

[9] S. Koenig and D. Yang. *Silting objects, simple-minded collections, t-structures and co-t-structures for finite-dimensional algebras.* Preprint (2012) arXiv:1203.5657v2.

[10] R. Martínez Villa. *Properties that are left invariant under stable equivalence.* Comm. Algebra 18 (1990), no. 12, 4141–4169.

[11] Z. Pogorzały. *Algebras stably equivalent to self-injective special biserial algebras.* Comm. in Algebra 22 (1994), no. 4, 1127–1160.

[12] J. Rickard. *Derived categories and stable equivalence.* J. Pure Appl. Algebra 61 (1989), no. 3, 303–317.

[13] J. Rickard. *Equivalences of derived categories for symmetric algebras.* J. Algebra 257 (2002), no. 2, 460–481.

Department of Mathematics, University of the Pacific, 3601 Pacific Ave, Stockton CA 95211, USA
E-mail address: `adugas@pacific.edu`